

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 3-7 are now pending in the application. Claim 2 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 5-7 stand objected because of informalities; specifically, Claims 5-7 are dependent upon cancelled Claim 2. Applicants have amended Claims 5-7 so that they do not depend upon cancelled Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this rejection has been rendered moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2002/0108702) in view of Oshima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,688,789). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that Ueno et al. discloses a protective sheet is provided on the dye receptor layer, and after the protective layer is provided the detection mark is positioned between layers. Specifically, Ueno et al. discloses the use of a detection mark on the dye receptor layer or under a transparent protective layer. As to the detection mark being on the dye receptive layer as shown in Figure 5, the detection mark is not between substrate sheets as recited in Claim 1. As to the detection mark being provided under a transparent protective layer, the detection mark


is not concealed from a human eye as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Ueno et al. fails to teach or suggest the placement of an identification mark between substrate sheets so that the identification mark is concealed from a human's eyes as recited in Claim 1. Oshima et al., likewise fails to disclose to suggest these features as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Ueno et al. nor Oshima et al., either singly or in combination, disclose or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, since the remaining claims depend from Claim 1, either directly or indirectly, Applicants respectfully assert they are likewise patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 27, 2006

By: 
Michael E. Hilton
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/jlk